arXiv:1603.09289v1 [math.LO] 30 Mar 2016

A SURREAL LIMIT
(SURREALIST LANDSCAPE WITH FIGURES)

PAOLO LIPPARINI

Abstract. We note that if a sequence of real numbers converges to some limit, then the sequence of the corresponding strings in the surreal $+, -$ sign expansion representation converges, for a natural notion of string convergence, to the string corresponding to the limit, modulo an infinitesimal. This would be obviously false if we were considering, as strings, decimal or binary representations, instead. The string limit of a possibly transfinite sequence of surreal numbers is always defined and, restricted to increasing sequences of ordinals, corresponds to taking the supremum. A transfinite sum can be defined using the string limit and this sum agrees with the representation of a surreal in Conway normal form.

If we compute, say, the number e by means of the usual series expansion, we get the following sequence of partial sums:

$$1,\ 2,\ 2.5,\ 2.666\ldots,\ 2.7083\ldots,\ 2.7166\ldots,\ 2.7180\ldots,\ 2.7182\ldots$$

Since the digits in the above decimal expressions eventually stabilize, we get confident that $2.718\ldots$ approximates the actual decimal expansion of e (of course, this is not a proof!). Though a similar argument goes well for many limits, it is not always the case that digits eventually stabilize in converging sequences. For example, consider the sequence

$$1.99,\ \ 2.01,\ \ 1.999,\ \ 2.001,\ \ 1.9999,\ \ 2.0001,\ \ \ldots,$$

which obviously converges to 2. In this case, no digit at all stabilizes.

The aim of this note is to observe that, instead, if we represent real numbers as sequences of $+$'s and $-$'s by means of the surreal sign expansion, and we consider a converging (in the classical sense of real analysis) sequence of real numbers, then the $+$'s and $-$'s which stabilize give the surreal sign expansion of the limit, possibly with the difference

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03H05; 40A05, 12J15.

Key words and phrases. Surreal number, real number, limit, sign expansion, string convergence.

Work performed under the auspices of G.N.S.A.G.A. Work partially supported by PRIN 2012 "Logica, Modelli e Insiemi".

of an infinitesimal. This shows that the apparently odd and strange surreal way of representing numbers, in particular, reals, by means of a sequence of +'s and −'s is, in a sense, actually a more natural way, in comparison with the usual decimal or binary expansions.

So far, the above result is just slightly more than a mere curiosity, but a few arguments presented below suggest at least some remote eventuality of further developments. See, e. g., Gonshor [G] or Siegel [S] for details and history about surreal numbers, in particular, for details about the sign expansion.

Notice that, again in the surreal sense, the sign expansion of an ordinal is a sequence of +'s. If we have an increasing sequence of ordinals, then every place in the sequence is stable from some point on, hence a construction similar to the above one furnishes the limit, that is, the supremum, of the sequence of ordinals.

The above ideas can be carried over in general, dealing with sequences of transfinite strings of symbols, or, even more generally, sequences of labeled linearly ordered sets. In this sense, we shall introduce a rather general notion in Definition 5 below. However, for a while we shall be content with the particular case of countable sequences of surreal numbers. For notational convenience, we shall identify a surreal number with its sign expansion, that is, its representation as an ordinal-indexed sequence of +'s and −'s. Thus a surreal number is a function $s : \alpha_s \to \{+, -\}$, where α_s is an ordinal depending on s. If $\beta < \alpha$, $s(\beta)$ will be sometimes called *place β (in the representation) of* s, and places $\geq \alpha_s$ will be dubbed *undefined*.

Definition 1. If $(s_n)_{n<\omega}$ is a sequence of surreal numbers, we define the *s-limit of* $(s_n)_{n<\omega}$, in symbols, $\operatorname{slim}_{n<\omega} s_n$ as the surreal s such that place γ in the sign expansion of s is defined if and only if there is $m < \omega$ such that, for every $n \geq m$, the sign expansions of the s_n's are identical up to place γ included. If this is the case, place γ of s is set to be equal to the corresponding place of s_m (hence also of the s_n's which follow). Notice that, by construction, if $s(\gamma)$ is defined, then $s(\gamma')$ is defined, too, for every $\gamma' < \gamma$, hence the definition is well posed.

The s-limit of a sequence is always defined; possibly, it is the empty sequence. Notice also that, as far as we meet a place at which the values of the s_n's eventually oscillate, we impose that the sign expansion of the s-limit stops at that point. This is necessary if we want Theorem 2 below to become true. A reason in support of this choice will be presented in Remark 4 below, suggesting that the definition might be interpreted in a way consistent with the "surreal philosophy".

Since a real number is (or can be considered as) a surreal number, we have also the notion of an s-limit of a sequence of reals. The main observation of the present note is the curious fact that if a sequence of real numbers has a limit in the sense of classical real analysis, then the limit and the s-limit coincide, modulo an infinitesimal.

In the proof of the following theorem we shall freely use the Berlekamp's Sign-Expansion Rule and the characterization of surreals born at day ω. See, e. g., [S, VIII, 2] for full details. Recall that, under the sign expansion representation, the surreal order is obtained by comparing the first difference. This is quite similar to the lexicographic order, but formally different; in the surreal sense undefined is considered to be between $-$ and $+$, rather than before them. Notice that the following theorem deals only with surreals born at most at day ω. We shall always consider *addition* $+$ in the surreal sense (symbols overlapping never causes confusion). Of course, when restricted to real numbers, surreal addition coincides with usual addition.

Theorem 2. *If $(r_n)_{n<\omega}$ is a sequence of real numbers and $\lim_{n\to\infty} r_n$ exists, possibly equal to $\infty = \omega$ or $-\infty = -\omega$, then $\lim_{n\to\infty} r_n = \operatorname{slim}_{n<\omega} r_n + \varepsilon$, where ε is either 0, or $1/\omega$, or $-1/\omega$.*

Proof. Let $r = \lim_{n\to\infty} r_n$.

First, suppose that $r = 0$. The conclusion is trivial if infinitely many r_n's are equal to 0, because of the definition of the s-limit. If all but finitely many r_n's are strictly positive, then the first sign in the surreal representation is eventually $+$. Since the sequence converges in the classical sense, then, for every $m < \omega$, we have $r_n \leq 1/2^m$ eventually, that is, the first $+$ sign is eventually followed by at least m minuses. This means that $\operatorname{slim}_{n<\omega} r_n = +---\cdots = 1/\omega$. If all but finitely many r_n's are strictly negative, the symmetric argument gives $\operatorname{slim}_{n<\omega} r_n = -1/\omega$. In the remaining case we have infinitely many positive r_n's, hence infinitely many occurrences of $+$ at the first place, and infinitely many negative r_n's, hence infinitely many occurrences of $-$ at the first place. Thus the first place does not eventually stabilize and, according to Definition 1, $\operatorname{slim}_{n<\omega} r_n = 0$, being the empty sequence.

The case when r is a dyadic rational is similar. A number r' greater than r and sufficiently close to r has the form $r + - - - \ldots$, where juxtaposition denotes string concatenation and, as far as r' approaches r, after the string $r+$ we get a larger and larger number of minuses, possibly followed by a plus and other signs. Thus if $(r_n)_{n<\omega}$ converges to r from above, $\operatorname{slim}_{n<\omega} r_n = r + - - - \cdots = r + 1/\omega$. Symmetrically, if $(r_n)_{n<\omega}$ converges to r from below, $\operatorname{slim}_{n<\omega} r_n = r - 1/\omega$. In the remaining cases, either $r_n = r$ for infinitely many n's, or there are

infinitely many n's such that $r_n < r$ and there are infinitely many n's such that $r_n > r$. In each of the above cases $\operatorname{slim}_{n<\omega} r_n = r$.

If r is real and not dyadic, then its sign expansion is infinite and neither eventually + nor eventually −. Suppose that $r > 0$, the case $r < 0$ being treated symmetrically. Since r is not dyadic, then, in particular, it is not an integer. Letting $[r]$ denote the integer part of r, we have that $|r - r_n| < \min(r - [r], [r] + 1 - r)$, for sufficiently large n, hence, from some point on, the integer part of r_n is the same as the integer part of r; moreover, r_n ha a binary point, too, hence these parts of the sign expansion eventually stabilize. What remain are the fractional parts, which are computed like the binary expansion, except possibly for a last sign/digit. Since the sign expansion of r is neither eventually + nor eventually −, then, for every $m < \omega$, both a + and a − occur after the m^{th} place of the fractional part of r. Let $q > m$ be such that both a + and a − occur between the $m + 1^{\text{th}}$ place and the q^{th} place of the fractional part of r. If $|r - r_n| < 2^q$, then r and r_n have the same fractional part up to the m^{th} place. Since m is arbitrary, the fractional part of the sequence $(r_n)_{n<\omega}$ eventually stabilizes to the value of the fractional part of r. In conclusion, the whole sign expansions stabilize to the sign expansion of r.

Notice that if r is not a dyadic rational, the same argument works for the binary expansions, as well. Hence, in the sense of the theorem, the sign expansion representation has some actual advantage over the binary one only for the countable set of dyadic rationals.

Finally, the cases when $r = \infty$ or $r = -\infty$ are trivial. □

The proof of Theorem 2 gives a bit more. A surreal s is *finite* if $-\omega < s < \omega$. Any finite surreal can be expressed uniquely as a sum $s = R(s) + \varepsilon(s)$, where $R(s) \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon(s)$ is infinitesimal. Then the proof of Theorem 2 together with Berlekamp's Rule and easy facts about the sign expansion shows that if $(s_n)_{n<\omega}$ is a sequence of finite surreal numbers and $\lim_{n\to\infty} R(s_n)$ exists and is finite, then $\lim_{n\to\infty} R(s_n) = R(\operatorname{slim}_{n<\omega} s_n)$.

Of course, the notion of limit in the classical sense and the notion of s-limit do not coincide, in general, even modulo infinitesimals. Indeed, the latter limit is always defined, while this is not necessarily the case for the former. As we mentioned during the proof, Theorem 2 shows that the sign expansion has some real advantage over the binary expansion only in the case of dyadic numbers. However, independently from Theorem 2, the sign expansion has the advantage of representing each real *uniquely*, while the choice of, say, the binary representation

$1.000\ldots$ in place of $0.111\ldots$ for the natural number 1 might be perceived as somewhat arbitrary.

The eventual presence of an infinitesimal in Theorem 2 does not seem to be a serious drawback. Anyone interested only in real numbers would surely feel free to ignore it. In a sense, the presence of $\pm 1/\omega$ has some use, since it tells us when the sequence converges from above or from below. However, notice the asymmetry between the cases of dyadic and nondyadic limits, since the infinitesimal can appear only in the former case.

Another notion of limit for ω-indexed sequences of surreal numbers is known and useful. It is usually denoted as the *Limit*, with upper-case L, and is obtained by taking componentwise the limits (in the sense of real analysis) of the coefficients in the Conway normal representation of the elements of the sequence. This Limit is not always defined: the componentwise real limits should always exist and be finite, and the result should give an actual surreal number (if the result contains an ascending sequence of exponents of ω, it is not a surreal number).

Though Theorem 2 shows that the Limit and the s-limit give quite close results when taking the limit of a sequence of reals, on the other hand, for arbitrary surreals, the two limits could turn out to be quite remote. For example, $\mathrm{Lim}_{n\to\infty} \frac{\omega}{n} = 0$, while $\mathrm{slim}_{n<\omega} \frac{\omega}{n} = \sqrt{\omega}$. This last s-limit might appear unnatural, but notice that $\sqrt{\omega}$ is "multiplicatively halfway" between $1 = \frac{\omega}{\omega}$ and ω. However, $\mathrm{Lim}_{n\to\infty}(\frac{\omega}{n} + 1) = 1$, while $\mathrm{slim}_{n<\omega}(\frac{\omega}{n} + 1)$ is still $\sqrt{\omega}$. This shows that the s-limit of a finite sum is not always the sum of the s-limits. In another direction, $\mathrm{Lim}_{n\to\infty} \omega^n = 0$, while $\mathrm{slim}_{n<\omega} \omega^n = \omega^\omega$, which seems much closer to intuition and corresponds to a general rule we shall describe below for taking s-limits of ordinals. As a final example, $\mathrm{Lim}_{n\to\infty}(\omega - n)$ is undefined, and $\mathrm{slim}_{n<\omega}(\omega - n) = \frac{\omega}{2}$, again, halfway between $0 = \omega - \omega$ and ω.

Probably, there is not a unique notion of limit for a sequence of surreals which is good for every purpose; in each particular case one should choose the most appropriate notion.

Taking s-limits of surreal numbers is not always a monotone operation. For example, if $a_n = n$ and $b_n = \omega - 1$, for every $n < \omega$, we have $a_n < b_n$, for every $n < \omega$, but $\mathrm{slim}_{n<\omega} a_n = \omega > \omega - 1 = \mathrm{slim}_{n<\omega} b_n$. Of course, a similar situation should occur for every notion of limit defined on *all* sequences of surreals, just assuming that the limit of a constant sequence gives its constant value. Then if the limit of some sequence is greater than all the elements of the sequence, you can also find a surreal in between the limit and all the members of the sequence, and the same argument as above applies.

It is not always the case that the s-limit of a subsequence coincides with the s-limit of the sequence. If $a_n = n$, for n even, and $a_n = \omega - 1$, for n odd, then $\operatorname{slim}_{n<\omega} a_n = \omega$, but $\operatorname{slim}_{n<\omega,\, n \text{ odd}} a_n = \omega - 1$. However, the s-limit of a nondecreasing sequence gives a result $\geq$ than all the elements of the sequence; moreover, a subsequence of a nondecreasing sequence has the same s-limit. Since the proofs of the above facts work as well for sequences indexed by ordinals $> \omega$, we shall present the general result. Notice that Definition 1 can be naturally extended to deal with arbitrary ordinal-indexed sequences; just consider those initial segments of sign expansions which are eventually constant. The reader can find full details in Definition 5 below.

Proposition 3. *Suppose that $(s_\beta)_{\beta<\alpha}$ and $(t_\zeta)_{\zeta<\eta}$ are nondecreasing sequences of surreals with s-limits, respectively, s and t. Then*

(a) $s_\delta \leq s$, for every $\delta < \alpha$.
(b) If $(t_\zeta)_{\zeta<\eta}$ is (an order-preserving rearrangement of) a cofinal subsequence of $(s_\beta)_{\beta<\alpha}$, then $t = s$.
(c) Suppose that $(s_\beta)_{\beta<\alpha}$ and $(t_\zeta)_{\zeta<\eta}$ are chained*, in the sense that, for every $\beta < \alpha$, there is $\zeta < \eta$ such that $s_\beta \leq t_\zeta$ and conversely. Then $s = t$.*

Proof. Let us say that two surreals γ'-agree if their sign expansions agree up to place γ' included.

(a) Let $\delta < \alpha$, we want to show that $s_\delta \leq s$. If, for every ordinal γ, place γ in the subsequence $(s_\beta)_{\delta\leq\beta<\alpha}$ is constant, then the subsequence itself is constant, the definition of the s-limit gives $s_\delta = s$ and we are done. Otherwise, let γ be the first ordinal such that place γ in the subsequence $(s_\beta)_{\delta\leq\beta<\alpha}$ is not constant. By the definition of γ, all the s_β's γ'-agree, for every $\gamma' < \gamma$ and $\beta \geq \delta$, hence, again by the definition of the s-limit, s and s_δ γ'-agree, for every $\gamma' < \gamma$. Since the s_β's γ'-agree, for every $\gamma' < \gamma$ and $\beta \geq \delta$, and the sequence is nondecreasing, the only possible transitions at place γ are from $-$ to undefined or $+$ and from undefined to $+$. By the definition of γ, at least one transition occurs and, since there is a finite number of possible transitions and no cycle is possible, place γ eventually stabilizes to some value, which will be the value in s. Thus $s_\delta < s$.

(b) Suppose by contradiction that $t \neq s$ and let γ be the first place at which they disagree. Hence at least one between $t(\gamma)$ and $s(\gamma)$ is defined. Suppose that $t(\gamma)$ is defined; the other case is similar and easier. By the definition of the s-limit, there is some $\bar\zeta$ such that t_ζ's γ-agree with t, for every $\zeta \geq \bar\zeta$. If $t_{\bar\zeta} \leq u \leq t_\zeta$ and $t_{\bar\zeta}$ and t_ζ γ-agree, then they γ-agree with u. Since $(t_\zeta)_{\zeta<\eta}$ is cofinal in $(s_\beta)_{\beta<\alpha}$ and $(s_\beta)_{\beta<\alpha}$ is nondecreasing, then the s_β's eventually γ-agree with $t_{\bar\zeta}$,

hence with t. Then the definition of s-limit gives that s γ-agrees with t, a contradiction.

(c) Consider a new sequence made by all the elements of both sequences, ordered in such a way that the new big sequence is still non-decreasing. Since the original sequences are chained, they are both cofinal in the big sequence (except perhaps for the trivial case in which all the sequences are eventually constant). If u is the s-limit of the big sequence, then, by (b), $u = s$ and $u = t$, thus $s = t$. □

As we hinted at the beginning, the s-limit of a non decreasing ordinal-indexed sequence of ordinals is their supremum. In general, the s-limit of an ordinal-indexed sequence of ordinals is their inferior limit, i. e., the supremum of the set of those ordinals α such that the members of the sequence are eventually $\geq \alpha$.

Since an addition operation is defined among surreal numbers, any notion of limit entails the definition of a series. If $(s_n)_{n<\omega}$ is a sequence of surreals, let $\sum^s_{n<\omega} s_n$ be $\mathrm{slim}_{n<\omega} S_n$, where S_n denotes the partial sum $s_0 + s_1 + \cdots + s_{n-1}$. By Proposition 3(c), if all the s_n's are nonnegative, then $\sum^s_{n<\omega} s_n$ is invariant under permutations, since the corresponding partial sums are chained in the sense of 3(c). Here we are using the general commutative-associative property of $+$ and the fact that the nonnegative surreals form an ordered monoid.

Since we can define the s-limit of every ordinal-indexed sequence of surreals, the above s-sum of length ω can be extended to the transfinite. Details go as follows. The s-sum of the empty sequence is 0. If $\sum^s_{\alpha<\beta} s_\alpha$ has been already constructed, let $\sum^s_{\alpha<\beta+1} s_\alpha = s_\beta + \sum^s_{\alpha<\beta} s_\alpha$. Finally, if β is limit, let $\sum^s_{\alpha<\beta} s_\alpha = \mathrm{slim}_{\beta'<\beta} \sum^s_{\alpha<\beta'} s_\alpha$. In the case when all the s_α's are ordinals, the above iterated natural sum has been studied elsewhere. Notice that, when restricted to ordinals, $\sum^s$ is different from the usual transfinite ordinal sum $\sum$; though the limiting process is the same, the successor steps in defining $\sum^s$ correspond to taking the natural ordinal sum, while in $\sum$ the usual noncommutative ordinal sum is used.

Invariance of $\sum^s$ under permutations does not extend beyond ω; actually, invariance fails already at stage $\omega + 1$. Just take $s_0 = 0$ and all the other s_α's to be 1. Then $\sum^s_{\alpha<\omega+1} s_\alpha = \omega + 1$, but if we permute s_0 with s_ω, we get ω instead. It will be probably interesting to consider transfinite s-sums in the case when all the s_α's are equal.

The s-sum equals the surreal sum in many cases, notably, it follows immediately from [G, Theorem 5.12] that $\sum^s_{\alpha<\beta} \omega^{s_\alpha} r_\alpha = \sum_{\alpha<\beta} \omega^{s_\alpha} r_\alpha$, provided the latter sum represents the Conway normal form of some

surreal. Thus the s-sum provides another more concrete interpretation for the formal series defining normal forms.

One could try to extend the classical series expansions of real analysis to infinite numbers by using the s-sum, for example, by considering $f(s) = \sum_{n<\omega}^{s} \frac{s^n}{n!}$. Though $f(\omega)$ gives the expected value ω^ω, which is equal to $\exp(\omega)$ in the sense of the surreal exponentiation, on the other hand, $f(\omega+1) = \omega^\omega$, too, hence series expansions through the s-sum generally give unwanted results. Actually, as follows from the proof of Theorem 2, if $e^r = d$ is dyadic > 1, then $f(r) = d - 1/\omega \neq d$, hence series obtained by using the s-sum do not always assume the exact wanted value even for real numbers. However, there is perhaps the possibility of modifying the s-limit and hence the s-sum in order to make things work better, but this is still to be developed. See the last sentence in Remark 6.

Remark 4. The *canonical representation* of a surreal s is $\{F \mid G\}$, where F, G, respectively, are the sets of those surreals which are initial segments of s and are $< s$, respectively, $> s$. If $(s_\beta)_{\beta<\alpha}$ is a sequence of surreals and $\{F_\beta \mid G_\beta\}_{\beta<\alpha}$ are their respective canonical representations, then a representation of $\operatorname{slim}_{\beta<\alpha} s_\beta$ is $\{F \mid G\}$, where $F = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} \bigcap_{\beta'\geq\beta} F_{\beta'}$ and $G = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} \bigcap_{\beta'\geq\beta} G_{\beta'}$, in words, we take as representatives only those elements which are eventually in the lower, respectively, upper sets.

The same remark holds if we start considering, as another representation, those F and G which are the sets of those surreals born strictly before s and are $< s$, respectively, $> s$.

As we mentioned, Definition 1 can be naturally extended in order to deal with sequences of strings of arbitrary symbols, not just $+$ and $-$. Actually, we shall present a generalization in which we take into account linear orders, not only well-orders.

Definition 5. Let A be any set and L, M be linearly ordered sets. We shall consider sequences of the form $(a_\ell)_{\ell\in L}$, where each a_ℓ is a function from some initial segment of M to A. Here both the empty set and M itself are considered to be initial segments.

It is useful to visualize the a_ℓ's as rows in an infinite $L \times M$ matrix with possibly empty entries. In this sense, a_ℓ is the ℓ^{th} row of the matrix, and $a_\ell(m)$ is the element in the m^{th} column of the ℓ^{th} row. (Warning: in the case when L or M is an ordinal, the above terminology might be misleading, since, say, 0 is the 1^{st} ordinal.)

We define the *s-limit of* $(a_\ell)_{\ell\in L}$, in symbols, $\operatorname{slim}_{\ell\in L} a_\ell$ as follows.

If L has a maximum $\bar\ell$, then we set $\operatorname{slim}_{\ell\in L} a_\ell = a_{\bar\ell}$.

If L has no maximum, then $\mathrm{slim}_{\ell\in L}\, a_\ell$ is the function a given by the following prescriptions. If $m \in M$, we declare $a(m)$ to be defined in case there is some $\ell(m) \in L$ such that, for every $m' \leq m$ and every $\ell, \ell' \geq \ell(m)$, we have $a_\ell(m') = a_{\ell'}(m')$. If this is the case, we let $a(m) = a_{\ell(m)}(m)$. It is immediate from the definition that the domain $\mathrm{dom}(a)$ of a is an initial (possibly empty) segment of M. In particular, the s-limit is *always* and uniquely defined.

Under the above matrix visualization, $a(m)$ is defined if there is some $\ell(m)$ such that all the columns before (and including) the m^{th} column are eventually constant from the $\ell(m)^{\text{th}}$ row on. Notice that we could have declared $a(m)$ to be defined just in case the m^{th} column is eventually constant. This would give a different definition of a limit; this latter definition has the drawback that it does not imply that $\mathrm{dom}(a)$ is an initial segment of M. To avoid the trouble, we can define another notion of limits of strings, call it $\mathrm{slim}^\diamond$, by declaring $a(m)$ to be defined if the m^{th} column is eventually constant *and* all the preceding columns are eventually constant, too (the difference with slim is that here we make no assumption about the points from which the columns become constant).

We believe slim to be more natural than $\mathrm{slim}^\diamond$. For sure, though the version of Proposition 3(a) holds for $\mathrm{slim}^\diamond$ with the same proof, the analogues of Proposition 3(b)(c) do not hold for $\mathrm{slim}^\diamond$. Consider the following increasing sequence of strings of length $\omega+1$: $a_0 = ------\cdots-$, $a_1 = +-----\cdots+$, $a_3 = ++---\cdots-$ $a_4 = +++--\cdots+$, ... (the main point is that signs in the last place alternate). If $(b_n)_{n<\omega}$ is the subsequence consisting of the strings with odd index, then $\mathrm{slim}_{n<\omega}\, a_n = \mathrm{slim}^\diamond_{n<\omega}\, a_n = \mathrm{slim}_{n<\omega}\, b_n = \omega$, but $\mathrm{slim}^\diamond_{n<\omega}\, b_n = \omega - 1 \neq \mathrm{slim}^\diamond_{n<\omega}\, a_n$; in particular, $\mathrm{slim}^\diamond$ and slim differ on $(b_n)_{n<\omega}$. The counterexample to 3(c) is obtained by considering also the subsequence consisting of the strings with even index. However, for many arguments in this note the two definitions would turn out to be essentially equivalent.

Notice that in the above definitions we simply discard those columns for which the entries are not eventually constant; actually, we discard all further columns which follow a column as above. In the case when we do not have to discard columns, we shall speak of a full limit. Formally, we say that a is the *full limit of* $(a_\ell)_{\ell\in L}$ if $\mathrm{slim}_{\ell\in L}\, a_\ell = a$ and, in addition, for every $m \in M$, if there is some $\ell(m) \in L$ such that $a_\ell(m)$ is defined, for every $\ell \geq \ell(m)$, then $a(m)$ is defined, too. In other words, the s-limit a of a sequence is the full limit of the sequences truncated at $\mathrm{dom}(a)$, where $\mathrm{dom}(a)$ is the largest possible initial segment of M such that the truncated sequences do admit a full limit. In the above

example, $\operatorname{slim}_{n<\omega} b_n$ is not a full limit, though, in the sense of $\operatorname{slim}^\diamond$, $\operatorname{slim}^\diamond_{n<\omega} b_n$ would actually be a full limit.

Notice that if $L = \omega$, then $\operatorname{slim}_{n\in\omega} a_n$ is invariant under permutations of the a_n's. For arbitrary L, slim satisfies a nice continuity property. If L is partitioned into convex subsets as $(L_i)_{i\in I}$, then I inherits from L the structure of a linearly ordered set, and then $\operatorname{slim}_{\ell\in L} a_\ell = \operatorname{slim}_{i\in I} \operatorname{slim}_{\ell\in L_i} a_\ell$, for every sequence a_ℓ. The s-limit behaves only partially well with respect to string concatenation, that we shall denote by juxtaposition. Though $\operatorname{slim}_{\ell\in L} ba_\ell = b \operatorname{slim}_{\ell\in L} a_\ell$ for all strings, it is not necessarily always the case that $\operatorname{slim}_{\ell\in L} a_\ell b = (\operatorname{slim}_{\ell\in L} a_\ell)b$: just take $L = \omega$, a_n of length n, for $n \in \omega$, and b of length 1. However, $\operatorname{slim}_{\ell\in L} a_\ell b_\ell = (\operatorname{slim}_{\ell\in L} a_\ell) \operatorname{slim}_{\ell\in L} b_\ell$ holds when all the a_ℓ's have the same length and $\operatorname{slim}_{\ell\in L} a_\ell$ is a full limit.

If $a = \operatorname{slim}_{\ell\in L} a_\ell$ then either the a_ℓ's restricted to $\operatorname{dom}(a)$ are eventually constant, or $\operatorname{cf}\operatorname{dom}(a) = \operatorname{cf} L$. The s-limit of a sequence is equal to the s-limit of some subsequence cofinal in L, but, in general, as we showed before Proposition 3, it is not necessarily the case that every cofinal subsequence has the same s-limit. However, if $\operatorname{slim}_{\ell\in L} a_\ell$ is a full limit, then every cofinal subsequence has the same limit.

Remark 6. One can introduce a shorthand for the surreal sign expansion. We can consider a surreal number as a sequence of nonzero signed ordinals. As in the standard case, 0 is represented by the empty sequence. If the first sign in the expansion of the surreal s is $+$, and we have exactly α consecutive $+$'s at the beginning, the first element of the shorthand is α; then if we have a certain number β of consecutive $-$'s, the second element of the shorthand is $-\beta$, and so on. In such a shorthand, ordinals and negated ordinals alternate. Let $\operatorname{sh}(s)$ denote the shorthand of s in the above sense. Taking Definition 5 literally would give us strange results, such as $\operatorname{slim}_{n<\omega} \operatorname{sh}(n) = 0$. However, we can adapt the definition by taking place by place the inferior limit for places which consist eventually of positive ordinals, taking the superior limit for places which consist eventually of negative ordinals, and considering a place undefined in the limit if it is not of the above kind, with the usual convention that also all the places which follow should be considered undefined. Let us denote by slim^* this modified limit acting on shorthands. It gives results different from slim. For example, the s-limit of the sequence $+-$, $++--$, $+++---$, $\dots$, is $+++\cdots = \omega$, while the s-limit* is $+++\cdots---\cdots = \omega/2$.

Of course, in the general sense of Definition 5, slim^* can be defined when A is a complete lattice. Maybe there are useful variations on the

above limit, say, using still different representations of surreal numbers. This has still to be investigated.

As is the case for most notions of convergence, Definition 5 can be extended to the situation when we work modulo some filter. Under the notations in Definition 5 and if F is a filter over L, we let the *F-limit* $F\text{-lim}\, a_\ell$ be the function a such that $a(m)$ is defined in case there is $X \in F$ such that, for every $m' \leq m$ and every $\ell, \ell' \in X$, we have $a_\ell(m') = a_{\ell'}(m')$. If this is the case, we let $a(m) = a_\ell(m)$, for some $\ell \in X$. Notice that the definition of the s-limit in Definition 5 is the particular case of the above F-limit when F is the unbounded filter over L. The definition in the present remark looks particularly promising, since if A is finite, F is an ultrafilter and, for every $m < \omega$, the a_ℓ's are eventually of length $\geq m$, then $F\text{-lim}\, a_\ell$ has length $\geq \omega$. We could have introduced a variant of the above definition (in the same spirit as of $\text{slim}^\diamond$) by saying that $a(m)$ is defined if, for every $m' \leq m$, there is some $X_{m'} \in F$ such that $a_\ell(m') = a_{\ell'}(m')$, for every $\ell, \ell' \in X_{m'}$.

In conclusion, at least from some point of view, the s-limit appears to be quite unnatural. For example, the s-limit of any sequence with infinitely many positive numbers and infinitely many negative numbers, no matter their size, is always 0. This is however essentially a consequence of the pleasant fact that the s-limit is *always* defined. On the other hand, besides having a very natural order/string-theoretical definition and a fine interpretation in the surreal spirit, as explained in Remark 4, the s-limit coincides with—or, better, incorporates— classical notions of limits in some significant cases. This suggests that the s-limit might deserve further study.

This is a preliminary version, it might contain inaccuracies (to be precise, it is more likely to contain inaccuracies than planned subsequent versions). We have not yet performed a completely accurate search in order to check whether some of the results presented here are already known. Credits for already known results should go to the original discoverers.

The list of references below is not intended to represent the historical development of the subject. It is not intended that, whenever we quote a result, the result should necessarily be attributed to the author of the quoted book. The reader looking for historical remarks, credits for original contributions and sources is invited to consult the listed books and, possibly, further references there.

References

[G] H. Gonshor, *An introduction to the theory of surreal numbers*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, **110**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.

[S] A. N. Siegel, *Combinatorial game theory*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, **146**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2013.

Dipartimento di Matematica, Viale della Ricerca Scientifica, Università di Roma "Tor Virgolettata", I-00133 ROME ITALY

URL: `http://www.mat.uniroma2.it/~lipparin`